Jason M. Kerr (8222) David R. Parkinson (8258) 5742 West Harold Gatty Drive Salt Lake City, UT 84116 Telephone: (801) 517-7000 Facsimile: (801) 517-7003

Attorney for Plaintiffs

(the "Motion").

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

CENTRAL DIVISION	
KLEIN-BECKER usa, LLC, a Utah limited liability company, and KLEIN-BECKER IP HOLDINGS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,  Plaintiffs  vs.  PATRICK ENGLERT individually and d/b/a MR. FINEST SUPPLEMENTS, STRIVECTIN-SALES, SKIN-CREAM-SALES, STRIVECTINSALES@AOL.COM, MR. FINEST.COM, MR. FINEST.COM, MRFINESTSUPPLEMENTS.COM; TOM ENGLERT individually and d/b/a MR. FINEST SUPPLEMENTS, STRIVECTIN-SALES, SKIN-CREAM-SALES, SKIN-CREAM-SALES, SKIN-CREAM-SALES, SKIN-CREAM-SALES, SKIN-CREAM-SALES, STRIVECTINSALES@AOL.COM, MR. FINEST.COM, MR. FINESTSUPPLEMENTS.COM; MR.	MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR 60 DAY EXTENSION TO FILE RESPONSE TO OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL  Case No. 2:06-CV-00378  Judge Ted Stewart  Magistrate David O. Nuffer
FINEST.COM,	

Plaintiffs Klein-Becker usa, LLC and Klein-Becker IP Holdings, LLC ("Plaintiffs") respectfully submit the following Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for 60 Day Extension to File Response to Opposition to Defendant's Motion for New Trial (Dkt. No. 339)

Defendants

## **MEMORANDUM**

Defendants have asked the Court for a 60-day extension to reply to Plaintiffs'

Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for a New Trial in their Motion (Dkt. No. 335) ("Opposition Memorandum"). Defendants, however, do not state valid reasons or circumstances why they should have sixty days to reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition Memorandum. Under Local Rule DUCivR 7-1(b)(4)(B), a movant has fourteen days after service of a memorandum opposing a motion to file a reply to the opposition memorandum. Plaintiffs filed the Opposition Memorandum on February 17, 2011. Any reply was therefore due—taking into consideration additional days for mailing—on March 7, 2011. Plaintiffs emailed the Opposition Memorandum to Defendants on March 29, 2011. Assuming Defendants' statement concerning being unaware of Plaintiffs' filing is accurate, any reply should be due, at the latest, by April 15, 2011. This date allows for fourteen days as per Local Rule DUCivR 7-1(b)(4)(B) plus three days for mailing. Plaintiffs therefore ask the Court to deny Defendants' Motion and set an April 15, 2011 deadline for Defendants to reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition Memorandum.

The Motion also asks for a 60-day extension to reply to Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs Pursuant to Rule 54(d)(2) (Dkt. No. 336) ("Reply Memorandum") and Declaration of Jeremy [sic] Kerr in Support of Motion for Attorney Fees (Dkt. No. 337) which supports the Reply Memorandum. Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as well as the Local Rules, Defendants do not have an automatic right to reply to these documents. The Court, therefore, should deny Defendants' Motion as applicable to these two documents.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Court should deny Defendants' Motion as applicable to Plaintiffs' Opposition Motion and set a deadline of April 15, 2011 to reply to the Opposition Motion. Moreover, the Court should deny Defendants' Motion as applicable to the other documents referenced in the Motion because Defendants do not have an automatic right to reply to these filings under the Federal or Local Rules.

DATED this 11th day of April, 2011.

/s/ Jason M. Kerr Jason M. Kerr Attorney for Plaintiffs

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 11th day of April, 2011, a true and correct copy of the Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for 60 Day Extension to File Response to Opposition to Defendant's Motion for New Trial was mailed, postage prepaid, to:

Patrick Englert 121 Civic Center Drive #275 Lake St. Louis, MO 63367 patrickenglert@aol.com

/s/ Jason M. Kerr